

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 476 545

CS 512 016

AUTHOR Clancy, Susan; Lowrie, Tom
TITLE Researching Multimodal Texts: Applying a Dynamic Model.
PUB DATE 2002-12-00
NOTE 11p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Australian Association for Research in Education (Brisbane, Australia, December 1-5, 2002).
AVAILABLE FROM For full text: <http://www.aare.edu.au/02pap/cla02237.htm>.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS
DESCRIPTORS Intermediate Grades; *Literacy; Middle Schools; Models; *Multimedia Materials; *Popular Culture; *Text Structure

ABSTRACT

The arrival of the digital age requires new approaches to understand the literacies used in making meanings from multimodal communications, and a rethinking of the ways in which research into these areas can be used to support learners in the 21st century. This presentation examines the range of literacies children have developed and used to make meanings when engaged with popular culture multimodal texts. The study encouraged 4 children (2 boys, aged 9 and 10 and two girls, aged 11 and 12) to share their experiences about texts that are generally marginalised within the traditional school culture, but that are part of children's everyday experiences. The Pokemon phenomena was used for investigation in this particular study. A model based around the multiliteracy elements identified by The New London Group (2000) has been developed to show the specific ways children use these elements to construct meanings across multimodal texts. This work has profound implications for educators who want to support children in their development of literacy abilities for life in contemporary society. (Contains 26 references and 1 table.) (Author/RS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Researching multimodal texts: Applying a dynamic model

Susan Clancy

Ms

Charles Sturt University

Locked Bag 588

Wagga Wagga NSW 2678

(Ph) 02 69332437

(Fax) 02 69332888

(Email) sclancy@csu.edu.au

RMB 21 Silverwood Road

Wagga Wagga NSW 2650

(PH) 02 69226711

Tom Lowrie

Associate Professor

Charles Sturt University

Locked Bag 588

Wagga Wagga NSW 2678

(Ph) 02 69332440

(Fax) 02 69332888

(Email) tlowrie@csu.edu.au

Key Words: Language and new literacies; Primary schooling

Abstract

The arrival of the digital age requires new approaches to understand the literacies used in making meanings from multimodal communications, and a rethinking of the ways in which research into these areas can be used to support learners in the 21st century. This presentation examines the range of literacies children have developed and used to make meanings when engaged with popular culture multimodal texts. The study encouraged children to share their experiences about texts that are generally marginalised within the traditional school culture, but that are part of children's everyday experiences. The Pokemon phenomena was used for investigation in this particular study. A model based around the multiliteracy elements identified by The New London Group (2000) has been developed to show the specific ways children use these elements to construct meanings across multimodal texts. This work has profound implications for educators who want to support children in their development of literacy abilities for life in contemporary society.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFORM,
AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC
COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY,
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Clancy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
2A INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Literature review

Multimodal texts are an integral part of today's society, (Snyder, Ed, 1997; Burniske, 2000). While 'acceptable' media texts, such as television and print media examples of advertising and current affairs, are beginning to receive more attention and to be addressed as texts within school contexts, there are still an enormous amount of other popular culture texts that are being completely ignored. These are the kinds of everyday texts that are part of daily life for children outside the school context. They include such formats as cartoons, music video clips and computer games. This privileging of certain types of texts over others means that the literacies children bring to school with them are being marginalised. This is not to say that there have not been some serious attempts to highlight this issue. Buckingham (1993) wrote extensively on the elements of television literacy and clearly identified the need to move beyond the notion of a single literacy, and to begin thinking about the idea of plural literacies. Kress (1995) has also argued the case of visual literacy and the need for new literacies, suggesting that there has been a reversal of the traditional roles of written and visual texts (cited in Anstey and Bull, 2000). As well, Hilton (1996) alerts us to the need for 'a model of literacy teaching that works with growing consciousness [so it] can build on the products and freedoms of the popular culture industry, [rather than] (not) closing the classroom door on gendered fantasies and indulging in moral panic' (p.44). Similarly, Pompe (1996) suggests that we 'are living in the age of streamlined and "delivered" curriculum' and that in so doing 'we have sidelined passion, playfulness and pleasure, while Murdoch and big culture machines are being allowed to engage children's desires and command their affections' (p.124).

The increasing awareness of the importance of critical literacy is also providing an avenue for research into the area (Muspratt et al, 1997; Knobel and Healy, 1998; Alvermann et al. 2001; Arthur, 2001). O'Brien (1998) found that 'giving Smurf books and children's rich understandings of them a place in the classroom-not just putting up with them, not ignoring them, not finding fault with them, but treating them seriously (p.24)', had several benefits in that it enabled close scrutiny of gender roles, it provided connections between children's home and school experiences and it added richness to the literate resources in the classroom.

Much popular culture, including Pokemon depends strongly on the use of visuals, a comparatively new field of study, which argues 'that the image has taken over the word as the primary source of information, ... and that the word has given away to the image as the fundamental process in the representation of the world,' and that 'it is also a dominant mode of interpretation' (Fuery and Masefield, 2000, p.88). Such a view however is not uncontested, and as long ago as 1977, Barthes, while acknowledging that the role of image required thought, also recognised that 'there are those who think that the image is an extremely rudimentary system in comparison with language' (p.32).

A further aspect of research that provides a focus for this area of study is the work that acknowledges the dynamic nature of the different kinds of literacies, that are being continually shaped and reformed as the demands of the texts we use change (Semali, 2002; Semali and Fueyo, 2002; Cope and Kalantzis, 2000; Unsworth, 2001).

We cannot afford to ignore the role of popular culture texts in children's lives (Giroux, 1999). These types of texts are the foundation of the entertainment business and they are controlled by multinational companies who are driven by the need to generate profit (Wasko, 2001). Given the fact that children spend large slabs of time with these texts, it is important that time is spent researching the learning that is happening. When pop culture texts are considered as serious sites for learning and contestation then classrooms can become more inclusive for all students. Learners can then begin to understand that the learning and literacies they have already acquired are transferable and valued and they can be supported in developing a critical stance in relation to the texts they use.

Context of the study

Four children participated in the study. Two boys (aged 9 and 10) and two girls (aged 11 and 12) were observed over a three-month period as they made meaning when engaged with a variety of multimodal texts. These texts were directly associated with the Pokemon phenomena and included information books, playing cards, computer games, internet sites and games (for example Game Boy, Pokeball). The boys frequently used all of these multimodal texts and played with one another on a regular basis. By contrast, the girls were more likely to play the computer or electronic games and rarely engaged in these activities with one another. Furthermore, the girls did not engage in these activities with the same regularity as that of the boys. The children formed part of a cultural group where participants regularly engaged in social interactions based around the use of various Pokemon texts. These four children were the central focus of this group-comprising two brother-sister relationships. The children lived in the same street and played together on a regular basis. The cultural group also involved a much broader community of children from the two schools they attended. Although the girls were not active participants in all aspects of this phenomena they were certainly familiar with all varieties of text and were not simply passive observers within either component of the cultural group.

After observing the children in naturalistic settings a set of semi-structured interview questions were developed which were intended to encourage the children to share their understandings about aspects of their personal Pokemon experiences. Not surprisingly, the children were quite enthusiastic about sharing their ideas. Two interviews were conducted, with the boys and girls interviewed separately. The interviews lasted approximately one hour with eight questions posed:

1. Can you remember how you first found out about Pokemon?
2. How did you get to learn about the way it all works?
3. Why did you want to know?
4. Was it hard to find out what you wanted to know?
5. Do you still have more to learn about?
6. What is/was the most difficult thing to do? Why?
7. What happens when someone doesn't know as much as you?
8. If you could invent one more thing what would it be?

The audio-taped interviews were transcribed and analysed in relation to: a) commonalities and differences between the two groups; and b) links between the naturalistic observations and key themes of the interviews. Thus, key ideas and phrases were highlighted and matched to notes taken during the observation phase of the investigation (Miles and Huberman, 1984; Yin, 1984). Of particular interest were the ways children constructed meaning across the variety of multimodal texts, the understandings developed and the information obtained by the children as they moved between and across these texts.

Development of model

This data was then analysed and applied to an existing multiliteracies framework developed by The New London Group (2000). This framework is one which 'focuses on "designs of meaning"-designs which involve the identities of all meaning-makers, which will not always be the same, and which are not necessarily or rigidly "right" or "wrong". Meanings either work or don't work for a particular social or cultural context' (Kalantzis et al, 2002, p.2). The multiliteracies framework grew out of the work of The New London Group, a group of colleagues with a common interest in the future of literacy education, who first came together in 1994. Their ideas and approaches to this field of literacy have since been documented in *Multiliteracies* (Cope and Kalantzis, 2000).

The purpose of this new model (see Figure 1) was to ascertain and explain how the children used and combined the modes of meaning. Additionally the researchers were interested to discover how the children determined the relationships across the texts, and whether any one mode predominated in the different texts. The analysis used the six design elements that The New London Group (2000) identified as being integral in the meaning making process: Linguistic Meaning, Visual Meaning, Audio Meaning, Gestural Meaning, Spatial Meaning and the Multimodal patterns of meaning which relate the first five modes of meaning to each other. The New London Group (2000) suggest that the Multimodal is the most significant of these design elements in that it can relate all other modes in quite dynamic relationships.

Multimodal meanings and relationships of different Designs of Meaning can be described through the two key concepts of hybridity and intertextuality. Hybridity highlights the mechanisms of creativity and culture-as-process where people innovate by articulating established practices and conventions within and between different modes of meaning in new ways. Intertextuality provides a focus for the potentially complex ways in which meanings are constituted through relationships to other texts (The New London Group, 2000).

Hybridity was constantly in action as the children participated in the game playing. They constructed, reconstructed, negotiated and organised their own pathways while remaining within the established practices and conventions of the game. Throughout this process they were foregrounding, combining and changing their reliance on different modes of meaning. In this way, within their cultural group, they were establishing new ways of developing their meanings. This aspect of the Pokemon phenomenon was considered by the children to be one of its best features because 'it's your own journey, you are actually the Pokemon trainer, it's your own choice'.

The concept of intertextuality was also an important part of the way the texts all fitted together. Because of the multimodal nature of the materials and the complementary nature of the content, the children frequently moved from one form to another, collecting and absorbing information that would better support their expertise and understandings. For example when a new Pokemon appeared they talked to friends, went to the books, checked out the cheat site and played the game. The composite information that they gathered from working out the relationships across the multiple text forms enabled them to become more proficient at the game.

At the centre of the model are the texts that the students identified as being what they need and use to participate in the Pokemon culture: books, cards, hand held games (for example, Game Boy, Pokeball), websites, television, movies. The outside circle shows the Design Elements that are integral for making meaning within the Multiliteracies framework and the inner circle contains examples from the data of the ways in which the students used their multiliteracies to make sense of the texts. It is important to note that although these have been separated out, the students were in fact consistently using Multimodal patterns of meaning, relying heavily on the concepts of hybridity and intertextuality to determine their meanings.

Linguistic Meaning

The students used Linguistic Meaning in a number of ways, across a range of texts. They used it to negotiate the trading of cards and to assume the roles of either expert or learner, particularly in the development of field knowledge. It enabled them to increase their skill levels, their ability to link information from one text to another and it scaffolded their understanding of the logistical aspects they required to engage effectively in the Pokemon culture. They also relied on Linguistic Meaning during the sharing of details and information from the handbooks. Talk revolved around the particular strengths and weaknesses of the different Pokemons, discussion about the ways this information could be used to make them better when using the Game Boy or when playing with the cards, and debate about how it would improve their trading skills. It was also evident that the children were using quite specific language (for example, clone, resistance, ephemeral) to describe Pokemon-based experiences.

Visual Meaning

Visual Meaning was an important component in their meaning making processes. It enabled them to readily identify the different Pokemons and it supported their need to be able to classify each of them in a range of ways, according to the needs of the form of text they were engaging with. The children used a range of visual cues to construct meaning and develop knowledge. Visual cues, for example, were utilised in the important process of classifying Pokemon and symbols were often used to match Pokemon across elements (for example, electricity, water) in order to determine the suitability of particular Pokemon for specific battles. Location and arrangement mapping skills also became an effective tool in the game when the children were able to pick up meanings through observing the legend and other symbolic representations on the maps.

Although recent advances in technology have pushed the boundaries between "real life" environments and 2D representations of 3D space, the actual visual images of the Pokemons are remarkably lacking in sophistication. This is particularly the case with the technology texts. Their visual representations are basic with only the key features needed to classify them incorporated into their design, and facially they show little variation in expression. This however did not seem to deter the users who were quite happy to work with what was there. Their interest was generated not by the appearance of the Pokemons, but by the different characteristics they exhibited and what they could do in battle. They were however, able to assess why the electronic versions of text lacked detail and depth-suggesting that the cost of the Game Boy was a critical issue.

Audio Meaning

There were a number of ways in which auditory features of the texts triggered Audio Meaning. As well as recognising particular voices, the children often used other auditory features as cueing systems to pre-empt what was about to occur, or to know which Pokemon was going to appear next. They knew that a change in pitch could signal the location of a Pokemon or that the duration of sound indicated success or failure in the Pokemon battle.

Gestural Meaning

Gestural Meaning was used in different ways. It became particularly important when the students were engaging in the game. This is when they readily resorted to physically movements and gestures. As they played they often acted out the actions of the different Pokemons that were in the game. Likewise, when they were watching the cartoons on TV they would use physical actions to convey their feelings, similar to the manner in which people watching an exciting game of sport will actively cheer, barrack and urge their team on.

Spatial Meaning

To be a successful participant in the Pokemon culture, students needed to use Spatial Meaning so they could work out maps, understand landscape orientation and use positional play. One of the most interesting aspects of sense making required by the children was the need to move between 2D and 3D visual representations. Computer simulation programs, despite their obvious advances, do not always make 2D-3D representations easy to interpret or understand. Children often find it difficult to transform their understanding of real-life experiences to the representations created on the screen (Lowrie, 1998). This is particularly the case when children have not yet established foundation spatial and visual concepts through lived experiences in a 3D world (Lowrie, 2000). In the present investigation it was evident that the children possessed high levels of spatial reasoning and visual discrimination as they moved between 2D (books and cards) and simulated 3D (electronic games) representations. The participants were able to make logical connections between these forms of representation and explain differences between the way in which the two contexts were represented.

Although in this model the researchers have tried to focus on how children used individual elements of meaning, they acknowledge that there are real difficulties because of the multimodal nature of the texts and the ways in which the elements themselves intersect and overlap with other elements. This reflects the view of The New London Group (2002), who have previously suggested that Multimodal patterns of meaning are the most dynamic of the design elements, in that it can relate all the other modes of meaning in quite dynamic relationships. For example, oral language can be linguistic, auditory and gestural, or written language can be considered linguistic and visual. The model itself is based on the data collected from the children, and it is dependent on how they described their meaning making processes. However, in the following table (see Table 1), we have also considered each of the forms of texts and summarised the different elements the children indicated that they used to make meanings from the different forms of text.

Table 1: A representation of the relationship between forms of text and Design Elements.

	Linguistic	Visual	Audio	Gestural	Spatial	Multimodal
Cards	√	√		√		√
Books	√	√				√
TV Cartoons	√	√	√			√
Game Boy	√	√	√	√	√	√
Movie	√	√	√			√
Websites	√	√			√	√
Pokedex	√	√	√			√
Pokeball	√	√		√		√

This table was used for two purposes, firstly to check out how many of the text forms were in fact multimodal, and secondly to ascertain whether or not any elements predominated in the children's meaning making processes. Clearly, all of the text forms rely on multiple elements, and at this point in the work it would seem that the linguistic and visual elements dominate. It became very clear from the data that the students did not see any of the texts in isolation. To make meanings clear and to improve their prowess in this multimodal culture they relied heavily on the notion of hybridity to innovate and develop meanings in new and different ways, and on the intertextual knowledge that they gained from working out relationships across and between the full gamut of the texts. During these processes they needed to make use of all the meaning design elements.

Implications

Although this is only a small study it gives rise to a number of implications.

- It demonstrates that within their cultural groups, children are able to make quite sophisticated connections across a variety of multimodal texts. These connections are being made in naturalistic settings, away from traditional classroom contexts.
- Not surprisingly, the children are not taking a critical perspective in relation to the ideological stance and representations evident in the texts. Given their enthusiasm about, and motivation to engage with such forms of texts, there is an enormous potential for classroom practitioners to address popular culture texts within critical frameworks.
- The inclusion of any texts within classroom cultures will always have the potential to marginalise some children. In this case, for example, it could be argued that gender or socio-economic access to these texts could be limiting factors. However, it is not the intention of this work to suggest that the example of multimodal texts being used here, the Pokemon texts, are the definitive texts within a culture, they are simply being used as a vehicle for the exploration of learning in relation to forms of popular culture texts that require users to work with Multimodal patterns of meaning.
- It is evident that larger and more diverse studies would greatly enhance educators' knowledge and understandings about children's learning outside traditional classroom contexts, the role such learning plays in preparing and supporting children for future life choices, and the implications and relevance this has when making decisions about classroom curricula.

References

- Alvermann, D., Hagood, M., and Williams, K. (2001) 'Image, language and sound: Making meaning with popular culture texts'. In *Reading online: New literacies*. <http://www.readingonline.org/newliteracies/action/alvermann/index.html>
- Anstey, M., and Bull, G. (2000) *Reading the visual*. Harcourt: Marrickville, Sydney.
- Arthur, L. (2001) 'Young children as critical consumers'. In *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 24(3), pp.17-26.
- Barthes, R. (1977) *Image, music, text*. Fontana Press: London
- Buckingham, D. (1993) *Children talking television*. The Falmer Press: London.
- Burniske, R. (2000) *Literacy in the cyberage: Composing ourselves online*. Skylight: Illinois
- Cope, B. and Kalantzis, M. (Eds) (2000) *Multiliteracies*. Macmillan: South Yarra.
- Fuery, P., and Mansefield, N. (2000) *Cultural studies and critical theory*. Oxford University Press: Melbourne, Australia.

Giroux, H. (2001) *The mouse that roared*. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers: Maryland, US.

Hilton, M. (1996) 'Manufacturing make-believe: Notes on the toy and media industry' pp.19-46. In Hilton, M. (Ed) *Potent fictions: Children's literacy and the challenge of popular culture*. Routledge: London.

Knobel, M., and Healy, A. (1998) *Critical literacies in the primary classroom*. PETA: Newtown, Australia.

Kress, G. (1995) cited in Anstey, M., Bull, G. (2000) *Reading the visual*. Harcourt: Marrickville, Sydney.

Kalantzis, M, Cope, B. and Fehring, H. (2002) *Multiliteracies: Teaching and learning in the new communications environment*. PEN 133, PETA: Marrickville.

Lowrie, T. (1998) Using technology to enhance children's spatial sense. In C. Kanes, M. Goss., & E. Warren (Eds.), *Teaching Mathematics in New Times* pp.319-328. Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia Incorporated. Griffith Uni Print: Brisbane, Australia.

Lowrie, T. (2000) A case of a reluctance to visualize. *Focus on Learning Problems in Mathematics*, 29(1), p.17-26.

Miles, M. and Huberman, A. (1984) *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Sage, Newbury Park.

Muspratt, S., Luke, A., and Freebody, P. (1997) (Eds) *Constructing critical literacies*. Allen and Unwin: St. Leonards, Australia.

O'Brien, J. (1998) 'Experts in Smurfland', in Knobel, M., Healy, A. (1998). *Critical literacies in the primary classroom*. PETA: Newtown, Australia.

Pompe, C. (1996) 'But they're pink!'-'Who cares!': Popular culture in the primary years, pp.92-125. In Hilton, M. (Ed) *Potent fictions: Children's literacy and the challenge of popular culture*. Routledge: London.

Semali, L. (2002) 'Defining new literacies in curricular practice'. In *Reading online: New literacies*.

<http://www.readingonline.org/newliteracies/action/alvermann/index.html>

Semali, L., and Fueyo, J. (2002) 'Transmediation as a metaphor for new literacies in multimedia classrooms'. In *Reading online: New literacies*.

<http://www.readingonline.org/newliteracies/action/alvermann/index.html>

Snyder, I. (1997) (Ed) *Page to screen*. Allen and Unwin: St Leonards, Australia.

The New London Group, (2000) 'A pedagogy of Multiliteracies designing social futures', in Cope, B. and Kalantzis, M. (Eds) *Multiliteracies*. Macmillan: South Yarra.

Wasko, J. (2001) *Understanding Disney*. Polity: Cambridge.

Yin, R. (1984) *Case study research: Designs and methods*. Sage, Newbury Park.



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)
Reproduction Release (Specific Document)



I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <i>Researching Multimodal Texts: Applying a Dynamic Model</i>	
Author(s): <i>Susan Clancy, Tom Lowrie</i>	
Corporate Source: <i>AARE Website</i>	Publication Date: <i>December 2002</i>

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one following notice is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <i>SAMPLE</i> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <i>SAMPLE</i> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <i>SAMPLE</i> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
☐	☒	☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) and paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for nonprofit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: <i>Susan Clancy</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>Susan Clancy, NLE, Education Lecturer</i>	
Organization/Address: <i>Charles Sturt University Wagga Wagga NSW Australia 2650</i>	Telephone: <i>0011 61 2 69332 437</i>	Fax: <i>0015 61 2 6933 2888</i>
	E-mail Address: <i>sclancy@csu.edu.au</i>	Date: <i>2/6/03</i>

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)